

there even after the battle. The experience was vividly impressed on my memory to this very day. As they came ashore, the usual thing would be to hunker down in a fox hole or a crater. But here was Mount Suribachi looking down. There was no such thing as a fox hole. They were being fired upon out on the beach. It is no wonder there were so many casualties.

My visit to Iwo makes me appreciate just what is meant when it is said that the progress of the marines of the V Corps was measured in yards, as Japanese defenders resisted to the death.

The Japanese were of a mood and psyche at that time, as they were through all of World War II, that they would rather be killed than give up. It was a Kamikaze mentality. We expected the assault on Japan, which we were training for, would be the same, and that, once again, emphasizes the importance of Iwo.

Yet, by February 24, 1945, 4 days after the onslaught began, the American flag waived from the summit of Mount Suribachi, the proud image that to this day symbolizes the unwavering resolve of the Marine Corps, of our Nation, and of the staggering sacrifices that were made by the marines in their relentless advance on Iwo Jima.

Uncommon valor was indeed a common virtue.

Just imagine you are there, and just think of the determination. You have flamethrowers, tanks, bulldozers, landing craft hit and on the beach and shot up and out of commission, and still you have to advance and neutralize and silence the fire from those hundreds and hundreds of enemy caves.

Well, by early March, the three Marine divisions had compressed the remaining enemy into isolated pockets of resistance. An awesome foe, the Japanese defenders fought with courage and determination, with the vast majority in their fanaticism, preferring death to surrender. The final pockets of resistance were finally eliminated, and the capture of the island was announced on March 26.

The casualty statistics are harrowing. Almost 7,000 Americans were killed, and more than 17,000 were wounded. But the assault and capture of Iwo Jima was of critical importance to final victory in the Pacific, and the island proved to be an important base from which to deliver more and heavier blows against the enemy. It also became the emergency landing field it had been envisioned to be.

And by the end of the war a total of 2,251 B-29 bombers, carrying 24,761 crewmen landed on Iwo Jima. A large number of these brave pilots and crewmen undoubtedly would have been lost if the land had not been taken.

Once again, you can imagine those planes coming in, shot up, battle damaged, wounded being taken out, planes repaired, wounded being given help, back to Guam or Saipan, and out again to pound Japan after being repaired.

Mr. President, I conclude my remarks by repeating the words of then

Secretary of the Navy James V. Forrestal, who was present on the island during the campaign, when he expressed his "tremendous admiration and reverence for the guy who walks up beaches and takes enemy positions with a rifle and grenades or his bare hands."

We have had a lot of battles, Mr. President, battles we read about. The battle of Iwo Jima, like Bunker Hill, Gettysburg, Belleau Wood, and Normandy, was won literally not just by machines but by young Americans who wanted to live but were not afraid to die for their country.

People go off to war with the flags flying and bands playing and we think about liberty and the pursuit of justice and world community and all of these things we like to talk about, loyalty to country. But to the people on a beach, it is a matter of them and their fellow marines that they are trying to survive alongside. And it is that Marine training, which makes them more afraid of letting their fellow marines down than they are of getting hurt, that wins those battles. Sometimes they are killed. Sometimes it is hard to explain that kind of psychology, that kind of mentality that wins battles, particularly a battle as vicious and as tough as was Iwo Jima. But that Marine gung ho spirit of being more afraid of letting each other down in a battle than they are of getting hurt or killed themselves, while hard to explain, is what is so important in winning battles. It means that a person will take grenades over to somebody and expose himself to fire because his fellow marines need that kind of help. It is what you have seen in the squadron where people dive back in on a target a second time to split up anti-aircraft fire. You would think that would be the most stupid thing anybody can do, but it is done because they see somebody in trouble.

So, Mr. President, to those brave Americans who paid the ultimate sacrifice on the black sand beaches of Iwo Jima and the rocky slopes of Mount Suribachi, "Semper Paratus" and may God's blessings rest on our Corps, on our military, and on this United States of America.

Thank you, Mr. President I yield the floor.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I enjoyed very much hearing the Senator from Ohio, Senator GLENN, who is a stalwart member of the Armed Services Committee and has been a stalwart defender of the United States his entire life, either as a member of the Marine Corps or in the space program or in his splendid service here in the U.S. Senate.

I heard him talk about Iwo Jima. All of us, I believe, are the beneficiaries of that reminder of the heroism that took place on Iwo Jima. And I might add that no one is better qualified to speak of heroism and patriotism and dedication than the Senator from Ohio, Senator GLENN, his plane having been shot five times when he was flying in the Marshall Islands, and I believe seven

times his plane was shot when he was in Korea fighting for our country.

So I thank the Senator from Ohio for that beautiful tribute to those who were so brave and gave so much of themselves for their country on Iwo Jima and other places in the Pacific.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now go into executive session to consider Executive Calendar Order Nos. 12 through 17, and No. 34, en bloc, nominations to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

The clerk will report the nominations.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Alton W. Cornella, of South Dakota; Rebecca G. Cox, of California; General James B. Davis, U.S. Air Force, Retired, of Florida; S. Lee Kling, of Maryland; Benjamin F. Montoya, of New Mexico; Wendi Louise Steele, of Texas; and Josue Robles, Jr., of Texas, to be members of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

The Senate proceeded to consider the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate on the nominations is limited to 30 minutes, equally divided between the President pro tempore and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN].

The Chair recognizes the President pro tempore.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I previously expressed my support for the confirmation of Mrs. Cox, General Davis, Admiral Montoya, Mr. Kling, Mr. Cornella, and Mrs. Steele to be members of the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. I want to reiterate that support and add to it my support of General Robles.

Mr. President, I have no doubt that our former colleague, Senator Alan Dixon, can complete this process by himself. However, I believe both he and the Senate would rather see a group of individuals make decisions on the future of the Nation's military bases and our local economies. Therefore, I urge the Senate to confirm these nominations and let the 1995 Base Closure Commission proceed with its work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator THURMOND in urging my colleagues to support the seven nominees to be members on Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

I agree with Senator THURMOND that each of these individuals are well-qualified to serve as members of the Commission.

Mr. President, I am certain that all of my colleagues are aware that the 1995 base closure process is well underway, as the Secretary of Defense presented his list of closure and realignment recommendations to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission on February 28. In fact, the Commission has conducted two hearings on the 1995 process with the Commission's chairman, Alan Dixon, conducting the hearings alone. And, as Senator THURMOND just reminded the Senate, former Senator Dixon, now Chairman Dixon, could act alone, if necessary, but that is not the way this process was set up. That is not the way we intended it. It is not the way the overall Congress intended it because we wanted all the commissioners. And so we are here today to try to confirm the other commissioners.

During those hearings that former Senator Dixon, now Chairman Dixon, just held, he stated more than once that he urged the Senate to act on the outstanding nominations at the earliest moment possible.

The 1995 commission has much work to do in the next few months, and the Senate should not impede on the commission's progress by further delaying action on these seven nominations. I do not doubt that Chairman Dixon could handle it alone, but I do not think he wants that, and I do not think any of us want that. I believe it is in the interest of the Nation that the Senate favorably act on the nominations before us today.

I urge my colleagues to approve the nominations.

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I do not think it is any secret that I had some grave reservations about going forth with the nominations of the BRAC commissioners. I have withdrawn any objection I had. I do not intend to ask for a recorded vote.

Let me tell you how it is and why it is that I was concerned.

Two years ago, my State, New York, was a victim of one of the most outrageous, self-serving, manipulative, politically mean-spirited and inspired acts under the former BRAC commission. Not the kind of thing that would engender confidence in a process that was to be fair, that was to be open, that was to take into consideration everyone's concern. A process that would not lend itself to the political process as we know it. A process of putting forth your best case, seeing to it that people have an opportunity to be heard, recognizing that this was not easy and that, regardless of the wisdom of the decision, there were going to be areas in this country that would suffer.

Let me tell Members that what the process did was close Plattsburgh Air Force Base and build up McGuire Air Force Base, and that one of the moving forces behind this travesty was none other than the Chairman of the BRAC

Commission. That does not inspire confidence.

In the 1993 round of closures, the Air Force proposed establishing an air mobility wing at Plattsburgh. They were going to put in an air mobility wing there. Their recommendation. It was not this Senator's. It was not anybody's in the community. They reasoned that the long runways and the vast apron at Plattsburgh were ideal for the large airlift aircraft.

Facilities at the base were new—new. Tens and tens of millions of dollars had been spent and the base was well laid out. To all observers it was the perfect match. But somehow the BRAC Commission saw it differently. They bullied the FAA into not objecting at the introduction to McGuire AFB of 70 to 80 large aircraft in the busiest air corridor in the world.

Now, Mr. President, it does not take one long to figure out that when we have one of the busiest commercial air corridors in the world, that is not the place where we put 70 to 80 large transports and say that that is going to be the mobility airbase. Not to mention the antiquated facilities. Not to mention the cost would be hundreds of millions of dollars in new construction.

The FAA did not object. After having created a tissue of false rumors and lies regarding Plattsburgh's crash zone and fuel delivery costs, the BRAC decided that, lo and behold, McGuire, the oldest, the most antiquated of the facilities, located in the middle of one of the heaviest traffic air corridors in the world, that that would be where the Air Force would move these planes.

They decided that McGuire, which the Air Force had initially recommended be downgraded to a reserve facility, obviously because of the traffic congestion in the air, that it be chosen as the new mobility hub.

Want to talk about politics in its rawest, nastiest, rottenest sense, that is it. That is the kind of thing that all Members have an obligation to avoid. The infamous proposal—by the way, because it took somebody with some ingenuity to suggest this—came from none other than one of the commissioners. That was H.T. Johnson, a former Air Force general. He harbored a grudge—well-known, well-known—and my distinguished colleagues on the floor, if they care to check into this will find out because there are no secrets in this business. H.T. Johnson did not like the then Air Force Chief of Staff Tony McPeak.

Can you imagine, here we now have these personalities, one former general is on the commission, does not like the then Air Force chief, and he knew that the Air Force and General McPeak were solidly behind the Plattsburgh proposal. So when H.T. Johnson came up with this plan, he did not have any trouble getting the Chairman of the Commission to quickly second it, to follow through on this deed, the commissioner himself having been a former Congressman from New Jersey, rep-

resenting that district in which this move was made.

Now, that is not what this process is to be about. We understand that there will be difficult decisions. We understand that. There has not been anyone here who has not seen them, and we understand, and we lick our wounds and we go on and do the best we can, and we try to get a community to pick up the pieces.

I have to say, this outrage was buried in a host of other recommendations to Congress. Senator MOYNIHAN and myself raised our voices. If there was any solace in what took place, it was that New York retained Rome Lab, which was located at Griffiss Air Force Base. It was the premier command and control research and development facility in the country.

The Air Force said, "Well, we will keep this going for another 5 years." Now, even that, in this last round, is gone. So, having been victimized once, the Pentagon is now recommending the closure of that lab, when they said "Do not worry." And now they come back and put it on the list. And to add insult to injury, where do you think they call for realigning some of its work? Fort Monmouth, NJ.

Now, look, there is a moral obligation and a commitment that this lab was going to be kept and the State went forward—the State of New York—putting forth millions of dollars. We built a comprehensive scientific foundation linked with all of the universities: Rensselaer, Syracuse, Poly Institute, Rochester Institute, University of Rochester, Cornell. And now, instead of being an integral part of the Air Force's 5-year plan, nothing. Based on those assurances, New York gave millions of dollars to ease the operating costs and further facilitate the transfer of lab products to the private sector—and we can do it, and we can eventually take over the entire Government cost. Give us those 5 years and it will not cost the Federal Government anything.

But, no, no, let me tell members how serious our State is. We are cutting spending. We have a deficit of \$5 billion. For the first time in 40 years the State is actually reducing spending. We will spend less this year than we did the previous year. Three percent less. I do not think there is another State in the country that is doing that, yet the Governor increased the budget allotments and saw to it that the funds for Rome lab would be continued.

The fact is that the Air Force deceived the Rome community into making investments in that lab, and now under their plan the hope for economic recovery is removed. It is morally wrong to do that to any community. If I saw that taking place in another community and my colleague addressed that and said, "Take a look and see what took place," where one general, former general, because of his dislike of another, moves to crush the plan which called for the location of

the air mobility center at a major installation, only to have that major installation—which was the best—decimated, closed down, with the remaining lab over at Griffiss. It was promised we will keep this and now we come back 2 years later and we will take that out as well.

That does not inspire confidence in the integrity of the process. Having said that, I say I am tremendously encouraged at the qualifications, the candor, the ability, and the credibility first of all of the Chairman of the Commission, our former colleague Senator Dixon, and after having seen the quality of the other commission Members.

Now, it is not easy for a commission to then restore a base once the Air Force or any of the services have put it on the list and said they are targeted. They do not generally do that. Not as a rule. But I certainly hope that we can make a case based upon the situation that exists today, and based upon what was morally indefensible, and what was done to the community by the BRAC Commission of 1993. It is a sorry saga, but one I believe that has to be told. I would not have come forth and made this public at this time were it not for what took place this year, following the commitments that were made, and the expectations that we had to save this facility. That is why I do so. It is a sordid, dirty, little story.

But if anything, hopefully we can learn by that. I think we have a moral obligation to see to it that this facility is continued. The Governor has assured me that he will do everything in his power to give whatever aid in reducing costs to this facility and helping to move it into the private sector and in helping to keep it the premier lab that it is.

So, Mr. President, it is on that basis that I have withdrawn my objection because, obviously, I understand there are decisions that have to be made. The taxpayers and the Members of this Congress have an obligation to see that our money is wisely spent and husbanded. This is not easy. But I thought that it was important to lay these facts out and, hopefully, we can avoid a repetition of that kind of thing. Nobody and no community should ever be subjected to it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to thank the able Senator from New York.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I did not intend to speak on this particular matter, but I heard the Senator from New York making some points. I do not know the particular situation in New York, but I know that the Senator and I share one thing in common, and that is the Pentagon's base closing nominations should not be considered as sacred by the Commissioners that we are about to confirm.

I have no intention of speaking at length or trying to block any of their nominations. As far as I know, they are all very honorable people, and I come not to resist them, not even to admon-

ish them, but to make a point which I hope they will seriously consider, and that is that the Pentagon's decisions are not perfect. They are not made in the cosmos. They are made by human beings who are subject to error.

Needless to say, that I am upset about what they are doing in my State would be a gross understatement.

In 1991, I daresay that my State was one of the two or three hardest hit States on the loss of jobs as a percentage of our people. We lost Eaker Air Force Base, a strategic bomber base, and we lost what we call the Joint Readiness Training Center in Fort Chaffee, AR, which was moved to Fort Polk, LA.

Eaker Air Force Base was in Mississippi County, which is in the First Congressional District of my State, which happens to be one of the 10 poorest districts in the United States. I do not have to tell you what closing a very significant air base in that county did to that county and the surrounding area. But if you look at it in pure terms of dollars and cents, you could not argue with it. When Senator PRYOR, and some of the rest of us, went before the Base Closure Commission and pleaded for them to take into consideration the economic consequences, they said, "That is not a part of our mandate."

That county had always had, even with the air base there, a very much higher unemployment rate than the rest of our State. We cannot consider the economic consequences, which is the same thing as saying we are not interested in human beings; we are not interested in the trauma and the tragedy that people experience when they lose their jobs and wonder how they are going to put bread on the table for their children.

But it was closed. We might as well have been shouting in the rain barrel for all the attention we got from the Base Closure Commission.

As far as Fort Chaffee was concerned, we showed conclusively, we crunched the numbers time and time and time again, and presented them to the Base Closure Commission and said, "You are supposed to be saving money. You will save a lot of money by closing Eaker Air Force Base, even though you are creating unspeakable, horrible consequences for a lot of people who are going to be thrown into the streets, but in Chaffee's case you cannot even justify the savings." The figures we gave them which, in my opinion, were absolutely unassailable and are unassailable to this day, went unheard, unheeded. We might as well, again, have been shouting in a rain barrel.

Now we have this new list of bases for closing that have been nominated by some faceless group in the Pentagon. After we took that kind of a hit in our State in 1991, I daresay that with this base closure list we are again one of the two or three hardest hit of any State as a percentage of our population. Red River Army Depot and the

Defense Logistics Agency Depot, sit side by side a few miles from Texarkana, which my colleagues know includes parts of Arkansas and Texas, as is near Louisiana; a city of 77,000 to 80,000 people, about 30,000 of whom are on the Arkansas side of the line.

Mr. President, since I have been in politics, I have stood with one leg in Texas and one leg in Arkansas 30 times. The line runs right through the Federal Building, half in Arkansas and half in Texas. Of the 4,100 people who work at the 3,600-acre Red River complex, 1,000 or so live in Arkansas. I know, as Deputy Secretary Deutch told me the other day, they do not consider economics, they do not consider red-blooded human beings who lose their jobs. Theirs is not to ameliorate that. Theirs is to look at hard, cold dollars-and-cents figures.

They did not cut these facilities in half, which would have been traumatic enough. They didn't try to figure out how can we eliminate this human drama, this tragic human drama unfolding by cutting their workload in half and leaving at least 2,000 people working there, or 3,000, or whatever.

I do not even know where they are going to transfer the work. I know there are two bases that do the same thing the Red River Depot does that are being left open that have never won the awards that Red River has won, such as the 1995 Presidential Quality Award. Red River is one of only six government facilities in the whole country to win that.

I listened to the Base Closure Commission hearings yesterday afternoon in my office, and the chairman, our former colleague, Senator Dixon from Illinois, asked did they take into consideration all of the achievement awards and the meritorious awards that Red River Depot had won? No, they did not. I regret the chairman said he had a tendency to agree with that.

Tell me, Mr. President, what is the purpose of people who have worked for the Federal Government trying to excel and be recognized for their excellent service if nobody is going to take it into consideration? What is that all about?

One other thing, Mr. President. What is it about these people who make these nominations that make them perfect and infallible, and their judgments and their decisions unquestioned? Do you think somebody on the Army or Navy or Air Force groups that made these recommendations does not have a brother-in-law working someplace? Do you think the fact that he has a brother-in-law working someplace does not play a role in his thinking about whether that base is going to be closed or this base is going to be closed?

That may be putting it a little strongly, but after all, we are all human beings, are we not? You may have a friend who gave your opponent money the last time, and it may have

shocked you and you are not ever going to feel as kindly toward that guy again. That happens in the Pentagon too. Decisions are not always based on what is best according to the facts.

Fort Chaffee, AK, is also on the list. It stands to lose 350 jobs. It is near Fort Smith, which is a city of about 80,000 people. They can withstand it. But I can tell you, the 350 people who are going to lose their jobs cannot stand it. Think of a city, all of you. I hope all of my colleagues will think of a city in their States with 77,000 people, like the entire city of Texarkana, in Texas and Arkansas. And take away 4,100 jobs. That is 5 percent of the total population. Each one of those jobs represents a family. Compute that. It is devastating, and it is unnecessary. And if it does cost a few more bucks to keep the place open, say, at half strength, or something of that kind, maybe the Pentagon should have decided to do that. But nobody in the Pentagon tried to work anything out. The Pentagon simply said, "Close that sucker."

Mr. President, I am emotional about it because I have been here 20 years and have not fired very many people. The people I really had to let go in my office had to be let go. But I know that when you take somebody's livelihood away from them, you are taking away everything. So I am really bothered when people lose their jobs.

The reason I am talking now, and I will close on this, is because I want this Commission—whom we are about to confirm—to bear in mind that everybody who made these closure recommendations has something in the back of their minds that caused them to make them, other than just those cold dollars-and-cents figures that were coming out of a computer.

Do you think there is no politics in any of this? Do you think these are sacrosanct things that people with noble purposes and no other goal conjured up?

So, members of the Commission, I just want to say, do not think for a minute that you do not have a responsibility to look at these things—not rubberstamp them, look at them—count the figures over and over again, take into consideration whose lives are being affected and whose children are not going to be educated as a result of the loss of their jobs.

I hope this Commission will look especially look at the Pentagon's recommendation to close Red River Army Depot and Fort Chaffee. I know there are other Senators—Senator D'AMATO has already spoken, and others will. A lot of people feel put upon. But let me reemphasize, Arkansas took the biggest hit in 1991 of all but two other States, and we are being asked to take one of the biggest hits in this one. What is going on?

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

NOMINATION OF ALTON W. CORNELLA

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is today taking up the confirmation of this important

group of nominees to serve on the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

In my home State of Montana, there have been some concerns expressed about one of these nominees, Mr. Alton W. Cornella of Rapid City, SD. Mr. Cornella has spent a number of years advocating for Rapid City's Ellsworth Air Force Base. And there has been concern that this may create a conflict with the interests of Malmstrom Air Force Base in Great Falls.

Frankly, when I first learned about this potential conflict, I was deeply concerned. The base closing process must be above politics and parochialism. And I would strongly oppose any nominee that I believe would not give Malmstrom and Montana an absolutely fair hearing.

That is why, last week, I called Mr. Cornella and spoke with him directly. He assured me that he would be impartial. Moreover, he agreed to recuse himself any decisions involving Ellsworth or any base deemed to be in competition with Ellsworth. These assurances are reflected in a letter Mr. Cornella recently sent to me. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cornella's letter be printed in the RECORD immediately following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BAUCUS. In closing, let me say that I found Mr. Cornella to be a man of integrity. I believe he aspires to serve on the Commission because he wants to render a public service for the entire Nation. And I wish him well in that endeavor.

#### EXHIBIT 1

AL CORNELLA REFRIGERATION SERVICE,  
Rapid City, SD, February 27, 1995.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BAUCUS: Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to discuss with you your concerns about my potential role as a Commissioner on the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

It is my understanding that I must recuse myself from any matter that would have a direct and predictable effect on any of my financial interests. Alternatively, I could divest myself of any asset that gives rise to a financial conflict or seek a statutory waiver. I have had discussions with the Commission General Counsel about such potential financial conflicts of interests. Based on these discussions, I have announced my decision to recuse myself from any matters affecting Ellsworth Air Force Base, if I am confirmed. This would include recusal from any other base that is determined to be a competitor with Ellsworth. For example, if the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense place Malmstrom Air Force Base in competition with Ellsworth, either in closure or realignment of missions, then Malmstrom would come within the scope of such a recusal.

In accordance with the procedures established by the Senate Armed Services Committee, my financial interests will be reviewed at the time the Secretary's recommendations are published, and throughout the proceedings, to determine what conflicts exist and what action is appropriate to address any conflict. The Commission Gen-

eral Counsel, in conjunction with the Department of Defense General Counsel and the Office of Government Ethics, will conduct such reviews.

I have attached the statements that I provided to the Senate Armed Services Committee during the confirmation process.

Please let me know if I can provide any additional information.

Sincerely,

ALTON W. CORNELLA.

RESPONSES OF ALTON W. CORNELLA TO QUESTIONS FOR DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT NOMINEES FROM THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

#### POSSIBLE CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Are you aware of any circumstances that might require you to recuse yourself from participating in the consideration of the proposed closure or realignment of a particular base or type of base? If so, please describe.

Yes. I served as the Chairman of Military Affairs for the Rapid City Area Chamber of Commerce. This included chairing a subcommittee called the Ellsworth Task Force or Defense Initiative. The purpose of the subcommittee was to provide a proactive approach to the preservation of Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD. I also own real estate in the area, and my firm has done business at Ellsworth Air Force Base. I will recuse myself on this base and any others determined as competitors by the General Counsel of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Have you ever participated on a compensated or uncompensated basis in any activity directed at precluding, modifying, or obtaining the closure or realignment of any base during the BRAC process? If so, please describe.

Yes. I served as Chairman of the Ellsworth Task Force on a uncompensated basis. The activity was directed at precluding the closure of Ellsworth AFB, SD. The base was not considered for closure in past rounds.

Have you been stationed at or resident in the vicinity of any base while the base was under consideration for closure or realignment during the BRAC process? If so, please describe.

Yes. I was a resident in the vicinity of Ellsworth AFB, SD when the base received additional missions and personnel from realignment under the 1993 BRAC process.

Do you or, to the best of your knowledge, does any member of your immediate family have any specific reason for wanting a particular base to be closed, realigned, or remain unchanged during the BRAC process?

My wife or I could suffer the same financial loss as any other member of the community if Ellsworth AFB, SD would be closed. For this reason, I will recuse myself on Ellsworth AFB and any other bases determined to be competitors by the General Counsel of the BRAC.

#### CONFLICT OF INTEREST FOR ALTON W. CORNELLA

This is in response to Senator McCain's request that each nominee review their own situation and provide a response for the record on his or her plans to deal with recusal or other conflict-related issues.

I will follow the procedure developed by the Committee and Executive Branch which was used by the 1991 and 1993 Commissions. At the time that the Secretary's March 1 proposed list is announced, the Commission's General Counsel, working with the DoD General Counsel and the Office of Government Ethics, will review my financial interests and advise me if any recusal or other remedial action, such as divestiture or waiver, is

necessary. The Commission's General Counsel will then advise the Committee of the results of this review and any subsequent actions that I would take to remove myself from any potential conflict. The Commission's General Counsel will also establish a procedure providing for similar review of my financial interests and transmittal of this information to the Committee when the Commission considers action on installations that are not on the Secretary's March 1 list.

If I am advised that a conflict of interest exists and that a statutory waiver is not available, I will either divest myself of the interest or recuse myself from that particular installation affected by the holding. If the number of recusals impairs my ability to effectively participate in a significant number of Commission proceedings, I agree to resign my position as Commissioner.

At the present time, the Commission's General Counsel and I have determined that I have a financial interest in Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota. I served as the Chairman of Military Affairs for the Rapid City Area Chamber of Commerce. I also served as Chairman of one of its subcommittees, the Ellsworth Task Force or Defense Initiative, which worked to preserve Ellsworth AFB. My firm has done business with Ellsworth AFB and I also own real estate in the area. My wife or I could suffer the same financial loss as any other member of the community should Ellsworth AFB be closed. For these reasons, I will recuse myself on Ellsworth AFB and any other bases determined to be competitors by the Commission's General Counsel.

#### A CALL FOR FAIRNESS IN BASE CLOSING

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, my friend and colleague from New York has elucidated the travesty that befell Plattsburgh and our State 2 years ago. It was the most parochial of decisions made by that Commission, and one for which they will long be remembered. I still recall the findings of the BRAC staff on a screen overhead, showing clearly that Plattsburgh had greater military value than McGuire. But that did not trouble much of anyone on the dais.

This year the Commissioners have the opportunity, and the obligation, to improve on the record of the 1993 group. The Air Force has proposed to move the finest laboratory in the Defense research establishment, Rome Laboratory, to Hanscom Air Force Base near Boston and to the Army's electronics laboratory in Fort Monmouth, NJ. Rome Laboratory has produced three generations of scientists in its 45-year connection with central New York. According to the Air Force, moving half of it one State east and half of it one State south is expected to save \$12 million per year. I have asked for an explanation of that claim, but say it is correct. For \$12 million annually we are to give up the established relationships between the lab and the ellipse of universities and industry in the region that have helped Rome to its numerous successes. For \$12 million annually we are to lose probably half the civilian staff of scientists who, by measure of similar situations with other labs, will leave the laboratory rather than move with it. This is shortsightedness of the highest order.

The return for moving Rome Laboratory is small. Only one other installation on the 1995 list, of all bases that will lose over 500 civilians, will get less of an annual and total return on the money saved per civilian lost. That is an Army ocean terminal. Closing it does not bring the immense loss of intangibles and productivity that moving a preeminent scientific institution does. This is not like moving the base laundry.

Most egregious about the Air Force recommendation is that 2 years ago the assistant secretary for installations put in writing that "the Air Force has no plans to close or relocate Rome Laboratory within the next five years." The people of Rome believed him. They trusted him. That was a mistake. They have spent 2 years planning the reuse of Griffiss Air Force Base, all of which was closed except for the laboratory, with the laboratory as the linchpin of their plans. They have lost 2 years in the redevelopment effort unless the commission sees the folly of the Air Force proposal.

Mr. President, my colleagues from New York and Arkansas have raised concerns I share about this process and the new Commission. I will be in touch with the new Commissioners shortly, and I hope they are aware of the standards they must restore.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, the Department of Defense's recommendations on base closings would have a very serious impact on Maryland. Up to 1,700 jobs could be lost—and an additional 4,000 potential new jobs are at stake. The effect of these job losses on families and communities would be devastating. I won't forget these families as I fight for Maryland's bases.

But I will fight for Maryland's facilities based on their military value. There are three basic criteria that must be considered. These are the mission, merit, and value to the Nation of each base. In Maryland, my colleague PAUL SARBANES and I are working on a bipartisan basis with the rest of the congressional delegation. We are also working together with task forces in our local communities to make our best case based on those principles. When the BRAC examines the recommendations in Maryland, those are the principles on which we expect to compete. And we expect to prevail.

I am shocked that some of the recommendations that the Commission will be examining do not appear to be based on merit, mission, or value to the Nation. The Navy's new plan to move the Naval Sea Systems Command [NAVSEA] to Washington, DC—overturning the last Commission's instructions to move to White Oak, MD—is incomprehensible.

In 1993, the Department of Defense found that we would save tax dollars by relocating many of the White Oak personnel to make room for the Naval Sea Systems Command, which has been in leased space. Nothing has changed in the last 2 years to change that assess-

ment. The strategic and budgetary reasons for the move have not changed. Already, many people have been transferred. Lives have been disrupted and new plans made. Now, the Navy's recommendation says that it was all just a big bait and switch game.

We are now beginning a new round of defense base closures by reexamining the decisions of the last round. The Navy is asking us to overturn decisions made by the 1993 BRAC, approved by the President and accepted by Congress. This is a perfect example of why people are frustrated with their government.

No one questions the merit of White Oak. Just yesterday, General Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said that the loss of White Oak's hypervelocity wind tunnel "could eliminate a unique national capability, a capability that serves military research and development needs and that is used by other agencies such as NASA." That wind tunnel, along with a 1.75 million gallon testing tank, are irreplaceable one-of-a-kind facilities.

This time, the burden of proof must be on the Navy. They must show that the merit of their new proposal significantly outweighs the findings of previous BRAC commissions. They must show that their mission can be performed better, quicker, and cheaper in Washington instead of in White Oak. And they must show that the Nation will achieve real savings from this new proposal. Those are tough standards \* \* \* but in 1993, those are the standards White Oak met. We will hold the Navy's new proposal to the same standards—and we don't think their numbers can add up or hold up.

The recommendation to close the Naval Surface Warfare Center in Annapolis is also a serious blow to Maryland and to the military. And it is another attempt to revisit decisions that were made during the 1993 BRAC.

Some of the Navy's most important research and development is done at the Annapolis site. We have one-of-a-kind facilities, and a world class workforce in place and working at peak capacity. Their mission is more important now than ever before—it is focused on the kinds of ship systems our Navy will need in the 21st century. And once again, the reasons and numbers haven't changed. So PAUL SARBANES and I will once again be leading the charge to maintain this vital facility.

The Army's recommendations, too, must be examined by the same principles and standards. I am deeply concerned that the recommendation to close Fort Ritchie was made without fully examining all of the missions performed at this post, and has not taken a full accounting of the value to the Nation of those missions. This post is almost 100 years old—but has proven to be one of the Army's most versatile facilities. It has constantly adapted and upgraded its facilities to fit changing communications needs. Its facilities

and workforce are unique—and must be maintained.

And nowhere does the concept of a full accounting become more important than at the Army Publications Distribution Center in Middle River. This center is competitive with the most technologically advanced private sector operations, yet the recommendation to close was flatout wrong when it said that they are not automated. I will push to make sure that one of the BRAC Commissioners visits this site, so that they can see this state-of-the-art facility first hand. With the facts in hand, I am confident that the Commission will recommend to the DOD that they revisit their recommendation entirely.

There are some silver linings for Maryland. The far-reaching and forward-thinking consolidation at the Naval Air Warfare Center, Patuxent River will continue. Pax River is the only Navy base in the country that can do aircraft acquisition, research, development, and training. This "one-stop-shop" is a crown jewel in the Navy. I will stand sentry during this BRAC process to ensure that the next century mission of Pax is not overlooked or undermined. And across southern Maryland, I am pleased that the value to the Nation of NESEA and the Naval Surface Warfare Center at Indian Head was acknowledged and maintained.

Another piece of good news is that additional jobs will be coming to both Aberdeen Proving Ground and Fort Meade. Each of these posts has a proud history of service and stand ready to make significant contributions as the military continues to reexamine the roles and missions they must perform in the new millenium.

Mr. President, before a serious consideration of the fate of Maryland's bases can begin, we must first confirm the nominations to the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. I fully support these nominees. They will be seeing a lot of me, because I will be fighting tooth and nail for Maryland's unique facilities and capabilities.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield back time on our side.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes forty-four seconds.

Mr. NUNN. I yield back the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations on the Executive Calendar, Nos. 12 through 17 and No. 34, en bloc, Alton W. Cornella, of South Dakota; Rebecca G. Cox, of California; James B. Davis, U.S. Air Force, Retired, of Florida; S. Lee Kling, of Maryland; Benjamin F. Montoya, of New Mexico; Wendi Louise Steele, of Texas; Josue Robles, Jr., of Texas, to be members of the Defense Base Closure Realignment Commission?

So the nominations were confirmed.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nominations were confirmed.

Mr. THURMOND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I wish to announce that there will be no further rollcall votes today.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I had thought that I might wait until tomorrow to speak on the vote that occurred this afternoon, but I think perhaps now is as good a time as any simply to reflect on what happened today, what has happened in the past and what is likely to happen in the future.

First of all, taking Social Security out of the amendment was a perfectly legitimate issue and I supported the Reid amendment and I supported the efforts of the Senator from North Dakota to take it out, but that is not the real reason I voted against this amendment. I voted against it because I have a reverence for the Constitution of the United States. I do not want it trivialized. I do not want to put economic theory in it. I do not want to put an unenforceable requirement in it. I do not want to put a requirement in there which can be taken away by 60 votes. And I do not want to have the people expecting to see the budget balanced in the year 2002 when that is highly unlikely in any case and utterly impossible under the other provisions of the Contract With America. That would raise the cynicism level about Congress still higher.

What I want to do is put this Nation on a glidepath toward a balanced budget and stick with it. We could reduce

the deficit \$20 billion a year and not disrupt the economy. The economy could handle it. And if the American people saw us doing that, year after year, they would be happy, they would see that we are solving the problem.

It is true the polls show that about 70 to 80 percent of the people of the country favor the so-called constitutional amendment to balance the budget, but I promise you they favor it because they are frustrated and they think it is the last best hope. And, second, they think there is some magic machine in the amendment that will balance the budget if they just put it in the Constitution as the 28th amendment.

Unhappily, nothing could be further from the truth. This afternoon the argument was made, why not submit it to the people? It is a powerful argument. The people like that argument. But for just a moment let me give a couple of extra thoughts on that. Since this great Republic of ours was founded in 1789, there have been over 11,400 proposals by Members of Congress to change that document—11,400. And we have adopted 18 of them, counting the Bill of Rights as one—that is the first 10 amendments to the Constitution all adopted at the same time.

Since then, 17 amendments have been ratified out of 11,400 proposed. What if we took the argument that every time a constitutional amendment came up on the floor we had a duty to submit it to the people? The people would not have time to work. They would be so busy voting on constitutional amendments they would not have time to hold a job.

Why do the Members of this body think that James Madison and Ben Franklin and all the rest of the Framers, in 1787, when they crafted this document—why do they think they gave Congress the first responsibility? And more important, why do they think they insisted that 67 percent of the Congress vote for it before it is submitted to the people? They did not say lay down in the aisle of the Senate and vote aye. They said we should deliberate. If they expected a two-thirds majority of both Houses to approve this thing before it went to the people of the country, surely to God they intended us to have a sensible debate on it. And we had one.

Mr. President, when you start tinkering with the Constitution of the United States, I belong to the "wait just a minute" club. I do not care how meritorious a proposal sounds. The Constitution has given this Nation 205 years of unfettered freedom the likes of which no other nation on Earth has enjoyed. And when you start trivializing the Constitution with amendments that are wholly unenforceable, people will lose their reverence for that sacred document. You see, I do not want just a balance-the-budget amendment that merely says we will balance the budget. I want actually to balance the budget. The people in my State and your